



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,239	04/20/2001	Srikanth Natarajan	10007591/020	9191
7590	08/08/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			PHAN, TAM T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2144		

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/838,239	NATARAJAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tam (Jenny) Phan	2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 4/20/2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/14/2005 has been entered. Claims 1 and 8 are currently amended.

2. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Priority

3. No priority claims have been made.

4. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 04/20/2001 (20 April 2001).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecheler et al. (WO 00/49769), hereinafter referred to as Lecheler, in view of Sugauchi et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,041,349), hereinafter referred to as Sugauchi.

7. Regarding claim 1, Lecheler disclosed a method of managing a computer network, comprising the steps of: assigning to at least one collection computer a management domain identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection computer

resides; receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier; and maintaining within the at least one management computer a mapping table [a database] of the information accessed using the management domain identifier (Title, Abstract, Figures 1 and 3, page 10 lines 7-19, page 13 lines 20-23).

8. Lecheler taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Lecheler did not expressly teach a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier.

9. Lecheler suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method of managing a computer network with additional features such as the trust/security feature (page 5 lines 2-11, page 19 lines 11-17).

10. Sugauchi disclosed a method of managing a computer network wherein at least one management computer receives information from a computer collection that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier (Figures 2, 6, 14, column 5 lines 49-55, column 6 lines 40-51, column 7 lines 24-44).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the network managing method of Lecheler with the teachings of Sugauchi to include the trust information in order to establish a trust relation (Sugauchi, column 4 lines 2-14) since the system management information collection would collect and store information from domains having a domain trust relation (Sugauchi, column 5 lines 49-55, column 6 lines 46-51).

12. Regarding claim 2, Lecheler disclosed a method wherein the step of assigning comprises the step of establishing at least one management domain, wherein each management domain

includes at least one collection computer (Figures 1 and 3, page 8 lines 10-31, page 12 lines 7-20).

13. Regarding claim 3, Lecheler disclosed a method wherein the management domain identifier is a domain name of the management domain (page 10 line 26-page 11 line 13).

14. Regarding claim 4, Lecheler disclosed a method wherein the information is network topology information (page 13 lines 14-23, page 15 lines 13-28, page 18 lines 3-11).

15. Regarding claim 7, Lecheler disclosed a method comprising the step of managing, by each collection computer, at least one network object; and resolving, by each collection computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the information received at the at least one management computer (page 10 lines 7-19, page 15 lines 13-28).

16. Regarding claim 8, Lecheler disclosed a system for managing a computer network, comprising: a plurality of collection computers, wherein each collection computer is assigned a management domain identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection computer resides; at least one management computer for receiving information, from the plurality of collection computers, that includes the management domain identifier; and at least one computer database for maintaining within the at least one management computer information accessed using the management domain identifier (Title, Abstract, Figures 1, 3, page 10 lines 7-19, page 13 lines 20-23). Sugauchi disclosed a system for managing a computer network wherein at least one management computer receives information from a computer collection that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier (Figures 2, 6, 14, column 5 lines 49-55, column 6 lines 40-51, column 7 lines 24-44).

17. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Lecheler and Sugauchi, claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected.

18. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulsipher et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,948,055) hereinafter referred to as Pulsipher, in view of Wesley (U.S. Patent Number 6,076,114).

19. Regarding claim 1, Pulsipher disclosed a method of managing a computer network, comprising the steps of: assigning to at least one collection computer a management domain identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection computer resides; receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier; and maintaining within the at least one management computer a database of the information accessed using the management domain identifier (Figures 2-5, column 3 lines 16-32, column 7 lines 41-57, column 8 lines 7-24, column 10 lines 13-25).

20. Pulsipher taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Pulsipher did not expressly teach a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier.

21. Pulsipher suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method of managing a computer network with additional features such as the trust/security feature (column 17 lines 38-51, column 31 lines 50-61).

22. Wesley disclosed a method for reliably data transmission wherein at least one receiving computer receives information from a sending computer that includes a trust flag relating to the communications link (column 9 lines 27-63, column 10 lines 33-51).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the network managing method of Pulsipher with the teachings of Wesley to include the trust information in order to include the trust flag relating to the management domain identifier in the information received by the management computer in order indicate to the management computer that the management computer could trust the management domain identifier (Wesley, column 10 lines 33-42).

24. Regarding claim 2, Pulsipher disclosed a method wherein the step of assigning comprises the step of establishing at least one management domain, wherein each management domain includes at least one collection computer (Figure 2, column 6 lines 11-19, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21).

25. Regarding claim 3, Pulsipher disclosed a method wherein the management domain identifier is a domain name of the management domain (column 10 lines 13-25).

26. Regarding claim 4, Pulsipher disclosed a method wherein the information is network topology information (Abstract, Figures 2-3B, column 6 lines 52-64, column 7 lines 41-57).

27. Regarding claim 5, Pulsipher disclosed a method, wherein the step of receiving comprises the steps of receiving first information from a first collection computer, wherein the first information includes a first network address and a first management domain identifier; receiving second information from a second collection computer, wherein the second information includes a second network address and a second management domain identifier, wherein the second network address is identical to the first network address; comparing the second network address to the first network address using the second management domain identifier and the first management domain identifier; assigning a network element associated with the second network address as a primary network element when the second network address belongs to a different

management domain than the first network address; and assigning the network element associated with the second network address as a secondary network element when the second network address belongs to a same management domain as the first network address (Figure 2, Figures 8A-8B, Figures 13-15B, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21, column 10 lines 13-25, column 11 lines 20-31, column 15 lines 33-48).

28. Regarding claim 6, Pulsipher disclosed a method wherein the step of maintaining comprises the step of using management domain identifiers to consolidate network topology information from collection computers having identical network addresses and belonging to different management domains (Figure 2, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21).

29. Regarding claim 7, Pulsipher disclosed a method comprising the step of managing, by each collection computer, at least one network object; and resolving, by each collection computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the information received at the at least one management computer (column 9 line 56-column 10 line 7, column 10 lines 13-25, column 11 lines 8-31).

30. Regarding claim 8, the system corresponds directly to the method of claim 1, and thus is rejected using the same rationale.

31. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Pulsipher and Wesley, claims 1-8 are rejected.

Response for Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

33. As the rejection reads, the Office asserts that the combination of these teachings render the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam (Jenny) Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3930. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tam T. Phan
August 2, 2005

tp

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
571-272-3932